Decoding in Compute-and-Forward Relaying: Real Lattices and the Flatness of Lattice Sums

Amaro Barreal, David A. Karpuk, *Member, IEEE*, and Camilla Hollanti

arXiv:1601.05596v1 [cs.IT] 21 Jan 2016

Abstract

In a distributed communications scenario, a relay applying the compute-and-forward strategy for the real-valued channel model aims to decode an integer linear combination of transmitted messages, a task of very complex nature for which general efficient algorithms for dimension $n > 1$ have not yet been developed. Nonetheless, the maximum-likelihood decoding metric related to solving for the desired lattice point exhibits interesting properties which lead to partial design criteria for lattice codes in compute-and-forward.

This article generalizes maximum-likelihood decoding at the relay to allow for arbitrary real lattice codes at the transmitters, and studies the behavior of the resulting decoding metric using an approximation of the theta series of a lattice, which is itself derived in this article. For the first time, the resulting random sums of lattices over whose points the relay needs to perform a sum are analyzed and furthermore, previous related work is extended to the case of $K > 2$ transmitters. The specific cases $K = 2$ and $K = 3$ are studied empirically.

Index Terms

Physical Layer Network Coding, Compute-and-Forward, Relaying, Lattice, Theta Series, Maximum Likelihood Decoding.

I. Introduction

Physical layer network coding generated much interest and excitement, especially during the past few years where research towards a fifth generation of wireless systems has been the

The authors are with the Department of Mathematics and Systems Analysis, Aalto University, Finland (e-mail: firstname.lastname@aalto.fi). Their work is supported by the Academy of Finland under Grants #268364, #276031, #282938 and #283262, as well as a grant from the Finnish Foundation for Technology Promotion.

center of well deserved attention. A particularly promising protocol, known as *compute-and-forward*, and proposed by Nazer and Gastpar in their award-winning paper [1], exploits the natural effects of interference by decoding linear combinations of the transmitted messages at the intermediate relays to achieve high computation rates. While the information theoretic aspects of this protocol have been extensively studied, not much work exists related to code design and decoding methods.

Originally, a relay operating under the compute-and-forward protocol would first scale the received signal before applying a minimum-distance decoder to obtain an estimate of the desired linear combination of the codewords. The decoding error probability in this scenario was studied in [2], where *lattice network coding* is further introduced as an extension of compute-and-forward to modules over principal ideal domains.

It was later in [3] where Maximum-Likelihood (ML) decoding at the relay was first studied. An approach to lattice code design for compute-and-forward was simultaneously derived therein, as well as in [4]. The fundamental work carried out in these two articles is essential for the present manuscript, as it introduces the notion of the *flatness factor* (cf. Defintion 7) of a lattice and utilizes it to derive an implicit lattice code design criterion. This criterion is indirect in the sense that it relates to a sum of random lattices over which the relay sums various Gaussian measures, and not to the lattice codes themselves. The relay cannot control this random sum, and the criterion has hence not been further investigated until now. It is also noteworthy that following the work [3], the common belief has been that the structure over which the relay needs to sum is a lattice for any number K of transmitters. This is, as shown later (cf. Remark 5) not the case if $K > 2$.

Connecting the flatness factor to the ML decoding metric in compute-and-forward involves a careful manipulation of the latter, and has been carried out in [3]; yet a major restriction needed to be imposed, and only integer lattices are allowed at the transmitters. It is this manipulation that allowed for the derivation of the first efficient decoding algorithms assuming a fading channel model, which were developed first in [3], [4] and, more recently, in [5]. To date, however, the algorithms only work in dimension $n = 1$ and for integer lattices.

While the ML decoding framework has only been scarcely studied and, as mentioned above, only integer lattices can be employed in the present state of research, other interesting lattices have been proposed for codebook design in the general context of compute-and-forward. The

authors in [6] construct lattice codes over the Eisenstein integers and prove the existence of nested lattices which are simultaneously good for quantization and additive white Gaussian noise channel coding. They further show that their proposed scheme can achieve higher rates than in the original work [1]. More recently, an adaptive scheme was introduced in [7] which, depending on the channel, selects the quadratic number field extension F which achieves the highest rate for that specific channel realization. The lattices used at the transmitters are carved out from a lattice associated to the ring of integers $\mathcal{O}_F$ of the chosen number field, and the decoded lattice point is hence an algebraic integer linear combination with coefficients in $\mathcal{O}_F$. Although the proposed scheme exhibits a high complexity, it it still shown that codes from algebraic lattices often provide an improvement in performance, and the the result from [6] that the Eisenstein integers on average achieve the highest rate are reproduced.

It is thus of interest to extend the ML decoding framework to allow for further families of lattices other than integer lattices, such as algebraic lattices. Our main interest lies in analyzing the flatness behavior of the ML decoding metric in compute-and-forward when varying the lattices at the transmitters. The main contributions are:

- Proposition 1 approximates the theta series of a real lattice given its generator matrix. This approximation is the main tool that allows us to analyze the behavior of the ML decoding metric in the latter sections of the article.
- An extension of the ML decoding framework from integer lattices to any real lattice in arbitrary dimension.
- For $K = 2$ transmitters, after a simplification of the ML decoding metric, we analyze the flatness behavior of the resulting function employing various real lattices at the transmitters. In particular, we employ algebraic lattices from quadratic and biquadratic number fields. This is, to the best of the authors' knowledge, the first analysis of the actual resulting decoding metric that has been carried out to date.
- We show that, for $K > 2$, the sum of Gaussian measures involved in the decoding process is not, as stated in related literature and commonly believed, performed over a lattice, but rather over a sum of $K-1$ random lattices. This prevents a straightforward generalization of the flatness factor of the decoding metric. We propose a generalization to $K > 2$ transmitters and, for the case $K = 3$, we prove in Proposition 3 an equivalent statement to the basic case and provide numerical results.

The article is organized as follows: We give an introduction to the essential aspects of lattice theory in Section II, and review the original compute-and-forward strategy in Section III. The ML decoding metric related to compute-and-forward is introduced in Section IV, where it is then further manipulated and simplified to ease its analysis, which is carried out in the subsequent Section V. Therein, we differentiate the cases of $K = 2$ and $K > 2$ transmitters and discuss the obtained results. Section VI concludes the paper.

II. Lattices and Theta Functions

This section is dedicated to acquainting the reader with basic concepts in lattice theory. In addition to presenting basic properties of lattices, we derive an approximation of the theta series of a real lattice (cf. Definition 5) in Proposition 1, a result that will allow us to carry out an extensive analysis of the behavior of the decoding metric in the subsequent sections.

In this article, a vector is labeled in bold, $\mathbf{v}$, and is always represented as a column vector.

A. Preliminaries on Lattices

Definition 1. *A* lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *is a discrete*[1] *subgroup of* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *with the property that there exists a basis* $(\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_t)$ *of* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *such that*

$$\Lambda = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} \mathbf{b}_i \mathbb{Z}. \tag{1}$$

We say that $(\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_t)$ *is a* $\mathbb{Z}$*-basis of* Λ*, thus* $\Lambda \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ *as abelian groups. We call* $t = \operatorname{rank}(\Lambda) \leq n$ *the* rank*, and* n *the* dimension *of* Λ*.*

A lattice $\Lambda' \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *such that* $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ *is called a* sublattice[2] *of* Λ*.*

More conveniently, we can define a *generator matrix* $M_\Lambda := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_1 & \cdots & \mathbf{b}_t \end{bmatrix}$ for a lattice Λ, so that every point $\lambda \in \Lambda$ can be expressed as

$$\lambda = M\mathbf{z} \tag{2}$$

for some coefficient vector $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Henceforth we will only consider *full* lattices, that is where $t = n$.

[1] By discrete we mean that the metric on $\mathbb{R}^n$ defines the discrete topology on Λ.

[2] Note that if $\dim(\Lambda) = \dim(\Lambda')$, then the index $|\Lambda/\Lambda'|$ is finite.

For two vectors $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle$ denote the Euclidean scalar product, which is a non-degenerate, positive definite, symmetric bilinear form. We can identify the space $\mathbb{R}^n$ with its dual vector space $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$ via the map

$$\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}) \tag{3}$$

$$\mathbf{x} \mapsto f_{\mathbf{x}}, \tag{4}$$

where $f_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}) = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle$. Given a lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we equivalently have the notion of its dual lattice.

Definition 2. *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a lattice. The* dual lattice Λ^* *of Λ is the lattice*

$$\Lambda^* = \mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda, \mathbb{Z}) = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \middle| \, \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for all } \mathbf{y} \in \Lambda \right\}. \tag{5}$$

Let us briefly go back and consider a lattice Λ with generator matrix $M_\Lambda = [\mathbf{b}_i]_{1 \le i \le n}$. The compact quotient $\mathbb{R}^n/\Lambda$ is an n-dimensional torus, and is obtained by identifying the faces of the *fundamental parallelotope* of Λ, defined as

$$\mathcal{P}_\Lambda := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{b}_i z_i \middle| \, 0 \le z_i < 1 \right\}. \tag{6}$$

Definition 3. *The* volume *of a lattice Λ is*

$$\nu_\Lambda := \mathrm{vol}(\mathbb{R}^n/\Lambda) = \mathrm{vol}(\mathcal{P}_\Lambda) = |\det(M_\Lambda)|, \tag{7}$$

and it is independent of the choice of the generator matrix M_Λ.

With the above expression, we can easily compute the volume of a sublattice $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ and of the dual lattice Λ^* as

$$\nu_{\Lambda'} = \nu_\Lambda \, |\Lambda/\Lambda'|, \tag{8}$$

$$\nu_{\Lambda^*} = 1/\nu_\Lambda. \tag{9}$$

A further useful function related to a lattice Λ is a *lattice quantizer* Q_Λ, a function that maps every point in $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to its closest point in the lattice. This function allows for a *modulo-lattice* operation $\mathbf{x} \pmod{\Lambda} := \mathbf{x} - Q_\Lambda(\mathbf{x})$, as well as for the following definition.

Definition 4. *Let Λ be a lattice and Q_Λ a lattice quantizer. The* Voronoi cell *associated with a lattice point $\lambda \in \Lambda$ is the set*

$$\mathcal{V}_\Lambda(\lambda) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n | \, Q_\Lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda\}. \tag{10}$$

The basic Voronoi cell *of Λ is $\mathcal{V}_\Lambda(\mathbf{0})$.*

B. Poisson Summation Formula and Theta Series

Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a lattice, and $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ an arbitrary function for which its *Fourier transform* $\hat{f}$ exists[3], defined by the formula

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{y}) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) e^{-2\pi\imath\langle \mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\rangle} d\mathbf{x}. \tag{11}$$

Lemma 1 (Poisson Summation Formula)**.** *[8, Thm. 2.3] Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a function as above. Then*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\Lambda} f(\mathbf{x}) = \nu_{\Lambda^*} \sum_{\mathbf{y}\in\Lambda^*} \hat{f}(\mathbf{y}). \tag{12}$$

We finally introduce the most important object, here, related to a lattice: its theta series.

Definition 5. *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a full lattice. For each $r \in \mathbb{R}$, define*

$$\mathrm{Nm}_\Lambda(r) := \left|\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda \mid ||\mathbf{x}||^2 = r\right\}\right|. \tag{13}$$

The theta series *of Λ is the generating function*

$$\Theta_\Lambda(q) := 1 + \sum_{r>0} \mathrm{Nm}_\Lambda(2r) q^r = \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\Lambda} q^{||\mathbf{x}||^2}. \tag{14}$$

Remark 1. *The theta series converges absolutely if $0 \leq q < 1$.*

Although of great importance, the theta series is unfortunately only known in closed form for a handful of lattices, and is usually given in terms of the *Jacobi Theta Functions*

$$\theta_2(q) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} q^{\left(i+\frac{1}{2}\right)^2}, \qquad \theta_3(q) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} q^{i^2}, \qquad \theta_4(q) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} (-q)^{i^2}. \tag{15}$$

For our purposes in the subsequent parts of this article, the lattices that we will need to analyze are by no means given in any nice way, but rather arise from random sums. In order to be able

[3]Necessary conditions for the existence can be found in [8, p. 37].

to deal with such lattices we propose the following result, which allows to approximate the theta series of a lattice given only its generator matrix. Before stating the proposition, we need the following technical definition.

Definition 6. *Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded convex set. We define the set $\mathrm{Lip}(n, T, L)$ to be the collection of such sets S for which there are T maps $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_T : [0,1]^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying for all $1 \leq i \leq T$ a Lipschitz condition*

$$|\phi_i(\mathbf{x}) - \phi_i(\mathbf{y})| \leq L\,|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|\,. \tag{16}$$

For a lattice Λ, we henceforth denote by $\lambda_{\min} := \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} ||\mathbf{x}||^2$ the minimum norm of Λ, which exists since Λ is discrete.

Proposition 1. *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a full lattice with fundamental volume ν_Λ, and write for convenience $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}$. The theta series $\Theta_\Lambda\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right)$, interpreted as a function of τ, can be expressed as*

$$\Theta_\Lambda\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right) = 1 + \frac{(\pi\lambda)^{\frac{n}{2}+1}\tau}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)\nu_\Lambda} \int_1^\infty t^{\frac{n}{2}} e^{-\pi\tau\lambda t} dt + \Xi_n(\tau, \Lambda, L),$$

where the error term is given by

$$\Xi_n(\tau, \Lambda, L) = \pi\tau\lambda C(n, \Lambda, L) \int_1^\infty t^{\frac{n-1}{2}} e^{-\pi\tau\lambda t} dt.$$

The involved constant $C(n, \Lambda, L)$ depends on n, Λ, and the Liptschitz constant L, but is independent of the variable of interest, τ.

Proof. Let $\alpha_r := \sum_{i=0}^{r} \mathrm{Nm}_\Lambda(i) = \left|\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda \mid ||\mathbf{x}||^2 \leq r\right\}\right|$. We can express $\Theta_\Lambda\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_\Lambda\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right) &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\Lambda} e^{-\pi\tau||\mathbf{x}||^2} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\Lambda} \int_{||\mathbf{x}||^2}^\infty \pi\tau e^{-\pi\tau t} dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty \#\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda |\, ||\mathbf{x}||^2 \leq t\right\} \pi\tau e^{-\pi\tau t} dt = \int_0^\infty \alpha_t \pi\tau e^{-\pi\tau t} dt.\end{aligned}$$

The substitution $t \mapsto \lambda t$ yields

$$\Theta_\Lambda\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right) = 1 + \int_1^\infty \alpha_{\lambda t} \pi\tau\lambda e^{-\pi\tau\lambda t} dt.$$

Let $B_0(\sqrt{r})$ be an n-dimensional sphere around the origin with radius $\sqrt{r}$, $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Then it is well known that

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \frac{\alpha_r \nu_\Lambda}{\mathrm{vol}(B_0(\sqrt{r}))} = 1,$$

and $\mathrm{vol}(B_0(\sqrt{r})) = \frac{\pi^{\frac{n}{2}} r^n}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)}$.

Further, let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that $\partial S \in \mathrm{Lip}(n, T, L)$. Then, if $\sigma(r) := |\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda \cap rS|$, we have

$$\sigma(r) = \frac{\mathrm{vol}(S)}{\nu_\Lambda} t^n + O\left(t^{n-1}\right),$$

where the constant in $O(t^{n-1})$ depends on the lattice Λ, n, and the Liptschitz constant L. For our situation, let $S = B_0(\sqrt{\lambda})$ so that $\alpha_{\lambda t} = \sigma(\sqrt{t})$. Then, $\partial S \in \mathrm{Lip}(n, 1, L)$ and

$$\alpha_{\lambda t} = \frac{(\lambda\pi t)^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)} + C(n, \Lambda, L)\sqrt{t}^{n-1}.$$

We can thus write

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta_\Lambda\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right) &= 1 + \int_1^\infty \alpha_{\lambda t} \pi\tau\lambda e^{-\pi\tau\lambda t} dt \\
&= 1 + \int_1^\infty \left(\frac{(\lambda\pi t)^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)\nu_\Lambda} + C(n, \Lambda, L)\sqrt{t}^{n-1} \right) \pi\tau\lambda e^{-\pi\tau\lambda t} dt \\
&= 1 + \frac{(\pi\lambda)^{\frac{n}{2}+1}\tau}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)\nu_\Lambda} \int_1^\infty t^{\frac{n}{2}} e^{-\pi\tau\lambda t} dt + \Xi_n(\tau, \Lambda, L).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 2. *Although the approximation of $\Theta_\Lambda(q)$ given in Proposition 1 involves an integral, the expression can be explicitly computed for a fixed dimension n, without the need of further approximations. For the cases treated later in the paper, that is where $n = 2, 4$, the approximation is explicitly given by*

$$\Theta_\Lambda\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right) \sim \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{e^{-\lambda\pi\tau}(1+\lambda\pi\tau)}{\nu_\Lambda \tau} & \text{if } n = 2, \\ 1 + \frac{e^{-\lambda\pi\tau}(2+\lambda\pi\tau(2+\lambda\pi\tau))}{2\nu_\Lambda\tau^2} & \text{if } n = 4. \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

C. Examples of Famous Lattices

We conclude this section by introducing various lattices that will be used in latter parts of the paper. Most of the following examples can be found in more detail in [9], and as a reference for the basic notions in algebraic number theory, we refer to [10].

1) The Lattice $\mathbb{Z}^n$: We start with the most standard example of a lattice, namely $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. The identity matrix $M_{\mathbb{Z}^n} = I_n$ serves as a generator matrix for $\mathbb{Z}^n$, and consequently $\nu_{\mathbb{Z}^n} = 1$. It is clear that $\lambda_{\min} = 1$, and we have $\Theta_{\mathbb{Z}^n}(q) = \theta_3^n(q)$.

2) The Checkerboard Lattice D_n: For $n \geq 3$, we define the lattice

$$D_n := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \equiv 0 \pmod 2 \right\}, \tag{18}$$

for which a generator matrix can be given as

$$M_{D_n} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{19}$$

We have $\nu_{D_n} = \lambda_{\min} = 2$, and $\Theta_{D_n}(q) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\theta_3^n(q) + \theta_4^n(q)\right)$.

3) The Lattice A_n: The n-dimensional lattice A_n, $n \geq 1$, is defined as

$$A_n = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1} \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i = 0 \right\}. \tag{20}$$

If $n = 2$, the lattice A_2 is known as the *hexagonal lattice*, and gets its name from the shape of its Voronoi cells, which are hexagons. A generator matrix can be taken to be

$$M_{A_2} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{21}$$

so that $\nu_{A_2} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{4}}$. We have $\lambda_{\min} = 1$, and further $\Theta_{A_2}(q) = \theta_2(q)\theta_2(q^3) + \theta_3(q)\theta_3(q^3)$.

In dimension $n = 4$, besides D_4, one of the most interesting lattices is the lattice dual to A_4, which can be represented by the generator matrix

$$M_{A_4^*} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & -\frac{4}{5} \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{5} \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & \frac{1}{5} \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & \frac{1}{5} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{5} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{22}$$

We can compute $\nu_{A_4^*} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}}$ and $\lambda_{\min} = \frac{4}{5}$.

4) Algebraic Lattices: Let F be a number field of degree n and signature (r, s), corresponding to the number of real and pairs of complex monomorphisms $\sigma_i : F \to \mathbb{C}$, respectively. Let further $\{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ be a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis[4] of the ring of integers $\mathcal{O}_F$ of F. We can construct a lattice from $\mathcal{O}_F$ via the following $\mathbb{Q}$-linear injective map, known as the *canonical embedding*:

$$\begin{aligned} &\Psi : F \to \mathbb{R}^n \\ &\quad x \mapsto \Psi(x)^t = (\sigma_1(x), \ldots, \sigma_r(x), \Re(\sigma_{r+1}(x)), \Im(\sigma_{r+1}(x)), \ldots, \Im(\sigma_{r+s}(x))) \,. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

We have that $\Psi(\mathcal{O}_F)$ is a lattice in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and refer to it as an *algebraic lattice*. A generator matrix for an algebraic lattice is given as

$$M_{\Psi(\mathcal{O}_F)} = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi(b_1)^t \\ \vdots \\ \Psi(b_n)^t \end{bmatrix} . \tag{24}$$

In this article, we will restrict to real quadratic and biquadratic number fields F, having signature $(n, 0)$ for $n = 2, 4$. It is well-known that these fields are of the form $F = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{a})$ in the former, and $F = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{a}, \sqrt{b})$ in the latter case, where $a \neq b$ are square-free, positive integers. We will shortly denote an algebraic lattice constructed from F by $\Lambda_F = \Psi(\mathcal{O}_F)$.

We refer to [10, Cor. 2] and [10, Ex. 42 (pp. 51)] for obtaining an explicit $\mathbb{Z}$-basis for the ring of integers $\mathcal{O}_F$ for $n = 2$ and $n = 4$, respectively.

III. The Compute and Forward Relaying Strategy

We briefly review the original compute-and-forward framework. Assume that $K > 1$ transmitters want to communicate to a single destination, aided by M intermediate relays which, operating under the original compute-and-forward strategy and assuming a real-valued channel model, attempt to decode an integer linear combination of the transmitted messages. The model is depicted in Figure 1. The first hop from the transmitters to the relays is modeled as a Gaussian fading channel, while it is usually assumed that the relays are connected to a destination with error-free bit pipes with unlimited capacities. The destination can, upon reception of enough linearly independent equations, attempt to solve for the original codewords. In this article, we are solely interested in the decoding procedure applied by the relays, and hence our focus will be on the first hop.

[4] $\mathcal{O}_F$ is a free $\mathbb{Z}$-module of rank n and, as such, has a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis.



Fig. 1: The general compute-and-forward system model.

The transmitters want to communicate messages $\mathbf{w}_k \in \mathbb{F}_p^s$, where p is prime, to the destination. Before transmission, these messages are encoded into n-dimensional codewords $\mathbf{x}_k \in \Lambda_{k,F} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\Lambda_{k,F}$ is a full rank lattice employed by transmitter k, acting as the *fine* lattice in the nested code $\mathcal{C}_k := \{[\mathbf{x}] \in \Lambda_{k,F} \,(\mathrm{mod}\ \Lambda_{k,C}) \mid \mathbf{x} \in \Lambda_{k,F}\}$. We impose a symmetric power constraint $\frac{1}{n}E\left[||\mathbf{x}_k||^2\right] \leq P$ for all k. The Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR) is denoted by $\rho = P/\sigma^2$, where σ^2 denotes the noise variance, and the fading variance is normalized, $\sigma_h^2 = 1$.

We can interpret the coarse lattice $\Lambda_{k,C}$ as the structure imposing the power constraint on the codewords, that is we restrict to codewords $\mathbf{x}_k \in \Lambda_{k,F}$ inside the fundamental Voronoi cell $\mathcal{V}_{k,C}$ of $\Lambda_{k,C}$. This allows us to ignore its specific definition in the upcoming analysis.

Throughout the paper we will only consider real valued channels, which are also studied in the original article [1] and additionally assumed in [3], [4]. Consequently, we will present the compute-and-forward strategy in its real version and refer to [1] for the complex alternative. For the received signal at relay m, we use the channel model

$$\mathbf{y}_m = \sum_{k=1}^{K} h_{mk}\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{n}_m, \tag{25}$$

where $\mathbf{n}_m$ is additive Gaussian noise with variance σ^2, and the channel coefficients are i.i.d. with normalized unit variance.

Channel state information is only available at the relays; more specifically, each relay only knows the channel $\mathbf{h}_m = \begin{bmatrix} h_{m1} & \cdots & h_{mK} \end{bmatrix}$ to itself. A fixed relay selects a scalar $\alpha_m \in \mathbb{R}$, as well as an integer vector $\mathbf{a}_m = \begin{bmatrix} a_{m1} & \cdots & a_{mK} \end{bmatrix}^t$, and attempts to decode a linear combination of the received codewords with coefficients a_{mk}. The channel model (25) is modified to read

$$\boxed{\alpha_m\mathbf{y}_m = \sum_{k=1}^{K} a_{mk}\mathbf{x}_k + \sum_{k=1}^{K}(\alpha_m h_{mk} - a_{mk})\mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_m\mathbf{n}_m} \tag{26}$$

and the *effective noise* $\mathbf{n}_{\text{eff}} := \sum_{k=1}^{K} (\alpha_m h_{mk} - a_{mk})\mathbf{x}_k + \alpha_m \mathbf{n}_m$ is no longer Gaussian.

As every relay proceeds in the same fashion, we can focus on a single relay and, for ease of notation, drop the subscript m henceforth. The focused system model, now resembling a K-user multiple-access channel, is illustrated in Figure 2.



Fig. 2: The focused compute-and-forward system model.

An important performance metric of compute-and-forward is the so-called *computation rate* explained in the following. Let $\mathcal{R}_M(k) = \frac{s}{n} \log p$ denote the *message rate* at transmitter k. The relay is able to decode a linear combination involving the codewords whose corresponding message rates are smaller than the computation rate $\mathcal{R}_C(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})$ achieved by the relay, that is which satisfy $\mathcal{R}_M \leq \mathcal{R}_C$. The main results on the computation rate are shortly summarized below.

Lemma 2. *[1], [11] In the above setup, a computation rate region of*

$$\mathcal{R}_C(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}) = \max_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2} \log^+ \left(\frac{\rho}{\alpha^2 + \rho ||\alpha \mathbf{h} - \mathbf{a}||^2} \right) \tag{27}$$

is achievable. This expression is further maximized by choosing α to be

$$\alpha_{MMSE} = \frac{\rho \mathbf{h}^t \mathbf{a}}{1 + \rho ||\mathbf{h}||^2}, \tag{28}$$

resulting in a computation rate region of

$$\mathcal{R}_C(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}) = \frac{1}{2} \log^+ \left(\left(||\mathbf{a}||^2 - \frac{\rho (\mathbf{h}^t \mathbf{a})^2}{1 + \rho ||\mathbf{h}||^2} \right)^{-1} \right). \tag{29}$$

Moreover, the optimal coefficient vector is the solution to the minimization problem

$$\mathbf{a}_{opt} = \underset{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^K \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}}{\arg\min}\, \mathbf{a}^t G \mathbf{a}, \tag{30}$$

where $G = I_K - \frac{\rho}{1+\rho ||\mathbf{h}||^2} \mathbf{h}\mathbf{h}^t$. Hence, $\mathbf{a}_{opt}$ corresponds to the coefficient vector of the shortest vector in the lattice whose Gram matrix is G.

Remark 3. *Solving for the optimal vector* $\mathbf{a}_{opt}$ *is in general a hard problem, but it has been shown recently that in certain instances it can be solved in polynomial time [12].*

A low-complexity approach for the case $K = M = 2$ *assuming no cooperation between the relays has also been proposed in [13].*

IV. Decoding Linear Equations

In the original compute-and-forward framework, nested lattices have been proposed for encoding data. Consider for each transmitter a nested code $\mathcal{C}_k$ consisting of a fine lattice $\Lambda_{k,F}$ and a coarse lattice Λ_C. Let the fine lattices be such that, after possibly reordering the indices, we have $\Lambda_{1,F} \supseteq \Lambda_{2,F} \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \Lambda_{K,F}$. Further, due to the symmetric power constraint, we fix the same coarse lattice Λ_C for each of the transmitters. Since the codebook is finite for each transmitter, the codewords can be assumed to be equiprobable in $\mathcal{C}_k$.

A relay attempts to decode $\sum_{k=1}^{K} h_k \mathbf{x}_k$ to a lattice point $[\lambda] = \sum_{k=1}^{K} a_k \mathbf{x}_k \pmod{\Lambda_C}$ in two steps:

i) After scaling the received signal (cf. (26)), compute an equation coefficient vector $\mathbf{a} = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_K \end{bmatrix}^t$ by solving the shortest vector problem (30), and decode (cf. (34)) an estimate $\hat{\lambda}$ of the lattice point

$$\lambda = \sum_{k=1}^{K} a_k \mathbf{x}_k \in \Lambda_F := \sum_{k=1}^{K} a_k \Lambda_{k,F}. \tag{31}$$

ii) Apply the modulo-lattice operation to shift the received signal back into the basic Voronoi cell $\mathcal{V}_C$ of Λ_C, that is, compute

$$[\lambda] = \lambda \pmod{\Lambda_C}. \tag{32}$$

Remark 4. *The requirement* $\Lambda_{1,F} \supseteq \Lambda_{2,F} \cdots \supseteq \Lambda_{K,F}$ *guarantees that*

$$\Lambda_F = \sum_{k=1}^{K} a_k \Lambda_{k,F} \tag{33}$$

is a lattice.

We are interested in the first step, that is, estimating $\hat{\lambda} \in \Lambda_F$, and will thus simply be interested in the role of the fine lattice in the decoding process.

A. The ML Decoding Metric

Let Λ_F be the lattice in (33). Since the codewords satisfy the imposed norm constraint, the desired lattice point λ is contained in a finite subset $L_F \subset \Lambda_F$ determined by the norm-restriction of the original codewords as well as the coefficient vector $\mathbf{a}$. Thus, L_F (indirectly) depends on the SNR. In this setting, ML decoding amounts to maximizing the conditional probability

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\lambda} &= \arg\max_{\lambda \in L_F} P\left[\alpha \mathbf{y} \mid \lambda\right] \\ &= \arg\max_{\lambda \in L_F} \sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_K)\in(\mathcal{C}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{C}_K) \\ \sum_{k=1}^{K} a_k \mathbf{x}_k = \lambda}} P\left[\alpha \mathbf{y} \mid (\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_K)\right] P\left[(\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_K)\right] \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

The former factor in the above expression behaves as

$$P\left[\alpha \mathbf{y} \mid (\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_K)\right] \propto \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2\alpha^2}\left|\left|\alpha \mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{K} \alpha h_k \mathbf{x}_k\right|\right|^2\right\} \tag{35}$$

and, since the codewords are equiprobable in $(\mathcal{C}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{C}_K)$, we conclude that the estimate $\hat{\lambda}$ of λ can be computed by solving

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\lambda} &= \arg\max_{\lambda \in L_F} \sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_K)\in(\mathcal{C}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{C}_K) \\ \sum_{k=1}^{K} a_k \mathbf{x}_k = \lambda}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\left|\left|\mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{K} h_k \mathbf{x}_k\right|\right|^2\right\} \\ &= \arg\max_{\lambda \in L_F} \varphi(\lambda), \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where we have defined

$$\boxed{\varphi(\lambda) := \sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_K)\in(\mathcal{C}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{C}_K) \\ \sum_{k=1}^{K} a_k \mathbf{x}_k = \lambda}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\left|\left|\mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{K} h_k \mathbf{x}_k\right|\right|^2\right\}.} \tag{37}$$

B. Decoding at the Relay

The goal of the rest of this article is to study the behavior of $\varphi(\lambda)$. As shown in [3], the function $\varphi(\lambda)$ can be *flat* for certain parameters, that is is maximized for multiple values of λ, and this ambiguity can lead to decoding errors. We first need to express the function in terms of λ itself. To this end, will rewrite the codewords in terms of the desired lattice point λ.

For each transmitter $1 \leq k \leq K$, let $M_k \in \mathrm{Mat}(n, \mathbb{R})$ be the generator matrix of $\Lambda_{k,F}$, so that we can write $\mathbf{x}_k = M_k \mathbf{z}_k$ for some $\mathbf{z}_k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Define $M := \left[\begin{smallmatrix} a_1 M_1 & \cdots & a_K M_K \end{smallmatrix} \right] \in \mathrm{Mat}(n \times nK, \mathbb{R})$, where $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, \ldots, a_K]^t$ is the solution to (30), and express the lattice point λ as

$$\lambda = \sum_{k=1}^{K} a_k \mathbf{x}_k = \sum_{k=1}^{K} a_k M_k \mathbf{z_k} = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} a_1 M_1 & \cdots & a_K M_K \end{smallmatrix} \right] \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{z}_1^t & \cdots & \mathbf{z}_K^t \end{smallmatrix} \right]^t = M\mathbf{z}. \tag{38}$$

The next step is to decompose the matrix M in the following way. Assume there exists[5] an orthogonal matrix $U \in \mathbf{O}(nK)$ such that we can write

$$\tilde{B} := MU = \left[B \quad | \quad 0_{n \times n(K-1)} \right], \tag{39}$$

where $B \in \mathrm{Mat}(n, \mathbb{R})$ is invertible. Decompose the matrix U into blocks $V_i \in \mathrm{Mat}(n, \mathbb{R})$ and $U_i \in \mathrm{Mat}(n \times n(K-1), \mathbb{R})$ as follows

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 & U_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ V_K & U_K \end{bmatrix}, \tag{40}$$

and define $\tilde{\mathbf{r}} := U^{-1}\mathbf{z}$, so that we can express the lattice point λ as

$$\lambda = M\mathbf{z} = \tilde{B}U^{-1}\mathbf{z} = \tilde{B}\tilde{\mathbf{r}} = B \left[\begin{smallmatrix} r_1 & \cdots & r_n \end{smallmatrix} \right]^t = B\mathbf{r}_n, \tag{41}$$

where $\mathbf{r}_n$ consists of the *first* n components of $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}$. We have precisely $\mathbf{r}_n = B^{-1}\lambda$, and write

$$\tilde{\mathbf{r}} = \begin{bmatrix} B^{-1}\lambda \\ \mathbf{r} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{42}$$

Using the decomposition of U in (40), we can write

$$\mathbf{z} = U\tilde{\mathbf{r}} = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 & U_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ V_K & U_K \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B^{-1}\lambda \\ \mathbf{r} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 B^{-1}\lambda + U_1 \mathbf{r} \\ \vdots \\ V_K B^{-1}\lambda + U_K \mathbf{r} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{43}$$

and thus express the components of $\mathbf{z}$ as $\mathbf{z}_k = V_k B^{-1}\lambda + U_k \mathbf{r}$. Consequently, we can rewrite the codewords $\mathbf{x}_k$ in terms of λ as

$$\mathbf{x}_k = M_k \mathbf{z}_k = M_k U_k \mathbf{r} + M_k V_k B^{-1}\lambda. \tag{44}$$

[5]We will later choose a specific decomposition for our analysis.

Note that we have $\mathbf{r} = \hat{U}\mathbf{z}$, where $\hat{U} := \begin{bmatrix} U_1^t & \cdots & U_K^t \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{Mat}(n(K-1) \times nK, \mathbb{R})$. Depending on the decomposition used on M in (39), the vector $\tilde{\mathbf{r}} = U^{-1}\mathbf{z}$ might not necessarily be an integer vector, thus neither is $\mathbf{r}$. Write

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_{\mathbb{Z}} + \mathbf{r}_{\mathrm{fk}} = \left(\hat{U}\mathbf{z}\right)_{\mathbb{Z}} + \left(\hat{U}\mathbf{z}\right)_{\mathrm{fk}}, \tag{45}$$

where $\mathbf{r}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is $\mathbf{r}$ rounded component-wise to the nearest integer, and $\mathbf{r}_{\mathrm{fk}} \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right]^{n(K-1)}$. For $\mu_k = M_k V_k B^{-1}\lambda$, explicitly given in terms of λ, we can thus write

$$\mathbf{x}_k = \mu_k + M_k U_k(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbb{Z}} + \mathbf{r}_{\mathrm{fk}}) = \mu_k + \mathbf{s}_k + \varepsilon_k, \tag{46}$$

where $\mathbf{s}_k$ is a point in a finite subset defined by the matrix $M_k U_k \in \mathrm{Mat}(n \times n(K-1), \mathbb{R})$. Note that $M_k U_k$ is a flat matrix, and due to its dimensions defines a sum of $K-1$ lattices, which is itself not a lattice for $K > 2$. We further have $\varepsilon_k = M_k U_k \mathbf{r}_{\mathrm{fk}}$, and this allows us to write

$$\left|\left|\mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{K} h_k \mathbf{x}_k\right|\right|^2 = \left|\left|\mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{K} h_k(\mathbf{s}_k + \mu_k + \varepsilon_k)\right|\right|^2 \tag{47}$$

$$= \left|\left|\left(\mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{K} h_k \mu_k\right) - \sum_{k=1}^{K} h_k(\mathbf{s}_k + \varepsilon_k)\right|\right|^2. \tag{48}$$

To further simplify the expression, define the matrix

$$\boxed{M_{\mathcal{L}} := \sum_{k=1}^{K} h_k M_k U_k} \tag{49}$$

which acts as a generator matrix[6] for the sum of $K-1$ lattices $\mathcal{L}$ and write

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} h_k(\mathbf{s}_k + \varepsilon_k) = M_{\mathcal{L}}\left(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbb{Z}} + \mathbf{r}_{\mathrm{fk}}\right). \tag{50}$$

An estimate $\hat{\lambda}$ of λ at the relay can thus be computed by solving the maximization problem (36), which can be rewritten as

$$\hat{\lambda} = \arg\max_{\lambda \in L_F} \sum_{\mathbf{t} \in S \subset \mathbb{Z}^{nK}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\left|\left|\omega(\lambda) - M_{\mathcal{L}}\left(\left(\hat{U}\mathbf{t}\right)_{\mathbb{Z}} + \left(\hat{U}\mathbf{t}\right)_{\mathrm{fk}}\right)\right|\right|^2\right\}, \tag{51}$$

where $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^{nK}$ is finite, and more conveniently as

$$\boxed{\hat{\lambda} = \arg\max_{\lambda \in L_F} \varphi(\lambda) = \arg\max_{\lambda \in L_F} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\left|\left|\omega(\lambda) - \mathbf{q} - \varepsilon(\mathbf{q})\right|\right|^2\right\}} \tag{52}$$

[6]The authors are aware of the abuse of terminology, as the resulting sum of lattices is not a lattice.

where $\omega(\lambda) := \mathbf{y} - \sum_{k=1}^{K} h_k \mu_k$, and $\mathbf{q}$ is a point in a finite subset $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ of the sum of $K-1$ lattices $\mathcal{L}$, that is if we write $M_{\mathcal{L}} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{\mathcal{L}_1} & \cdots & M_{\mathcal{L}_{K-1}} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{Mat}(n \times n(K-1), \mathbb{R})$, then $\mathbf{q} = \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbf{q}_k$ where $\mathbf{q}_k$ is a point in a finite subset of the lattice $\mathcal{L}_k$ generated by $M_{\mathcal{L}_k} \in \mathrm{Mat}(n, \mathbb{R})$.

Remark 5. *We need to point out that the authors in [3], [4], probably because they are not aiming at analyzing the behavior of $\varphi(\lambda)$ for actual resulting lattice sums $\mathcal{L}$, state that $\mathcal{L}$ is a lattice for any number $K > 1$ of transmitters.*

This misapprehension is understandable, as it is still the sum of $K-1$ lattices, thus a lattice for the case $K = 2$, which is the standard case to consider. It is, however, certainly not a lattice when $K > 2$. Although it still is an additive subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^n$, it is no longer discrete, and an important consequence is that the function $\varphi(\lambda)$ does not converge when summing over all of $\mathcal{L}$. The main problem is the effect of the random channel coefficients h_k, which cannot be controled and inhibit $\mathcal{L}$ from exhibiting a lattice structure.

This fact has dramatic consequences, since it implies that the tools developed in [3] for analyzing the behavior of $\mathcal{L}$ can only be applied in the basic case $K = 2$. Hence, a modification is needed for $K > 2$, and we will later propose an alternative quantity for the purpose of analysis for the case $K = 3$.

The previous manipulation assumed a decomposition of the matrix M in (39). For the subsequent analysis of the function $\varphi(\lambda)$ we will specifically use the LQ-decomposition of M, that is decompose the matrix as $M = LQ$ with $L \in \mathrm{Mat}(n \times nK, \mathbb{R})$ of the form $L = \begin{bmatrix} B & | & 0_{n \times n(K-1)} \end{bmatrix}$, where $B \in \mathrm{Mat}(n, \mathbb{R})$ is lower triangular. It is well known that the matrix L is unique if its diagonal is forced to be positive. We further choose $U := Q$ and have thus found an unitary matrix such that $\tilde{B} := MU = \begin{bmatrix} B & | & 0_{n \times n(K-1)} \end{bmatrix}$, as desired.

Remark 6. *In [3], the use of the* Hermite Normal Form *is proposed as the decomposition, since it is a classical tool for solving Diophantine equations. The use of this specific decomposition, however, would only allow us to use integer lattices. This has obvious disadvantages, especially since this not only restricts the lattices that we can use, but even when using integer lattices we have only access to very restrictive rotations and scalings. Also, normalizing an integer lattice to unit volume might result in a non-integer lattice (*e.g. D_4*), making a meaningful comparison between lattices impossible.*

An advantage of using the Hermite Normal Form, though, is that the matrix $U \in \mathrm{GL}(nK, \mathbb{Z})$ *is unimodular, so that* $\mathbf{r} := U^{-1}\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nK}$ *and, hence,* $\varepsilon(\mathbf{q}) = 0$ *for all* $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{L}$*. Nonetheless, note that in order to be able to solve the problem* (52)*, no additional knowledge about the codewords* $\mathbf{x}_k$ *is required by the relay, as it only needs to compute the matrix* U *and a coefficient vector* $\mathbf{a}$*.*

V. The behavior of $\varphi(\lambda)$

In the previous section and following the work in [3], the ML decoding metric was manipulated in such a way that it can be presented in terms of the desired lattice point. The obtained expression provides an explicit decoding problem at the relay, which attempts to decode an integer liner combination of the original codewords by maximizing the modified decoding metric. In this section, we analyze the behavior of the function

$$\varphi(\lambda) = \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \overline{\mathcal{L}}} \exp\left\{ \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left|\left| \omega(\lambda) - \mathbf{q} - \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}) \right|\right|^2 \right\}, \tag{53}$$

which, as indicated in [3], can be flat for certain parameters leading to ambiguous decoding decisions and ultimately resulting in decoding errors. In the following, we illustrate the behavior of $\varphi(\lambda)$ in Figure 3 and 4 for dimensions $n = 1, 2$, respectively.



(a) $\mathbf{h} = [0.2995\ 1.2954]^t$, SNR = 30dB, $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_2 = \mathbb{Z}$. Messages $x_1 = 2$, $x_2 = -1$, the optimal coefficient vector is $\mathbf{a} = [1\ 4]^t$, the maximum is correctly attained at $\lambda = a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 = -2$.



(b) $\mathbf{h} = [-2.2015\ -0.7745]^t$, SNR = 10dB, $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_2 = \mathbb{Z}$. Messages $x_1 = x_2 = -3$, the optimal coefficient vector is $\mathbf{a} = [1\ 0]^t$, the function $\varphi(\lambda)$ is maximized for multiple values of λ.

Fig. 3: Behavior of $\varphi(\lambda)$ in dimension $n = 1$ for $K = 2$ transmitters.



(a) $\mathbf{h} = [-1.1911\ -0.2286]^t$, SNR = 30dB, $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_2 = \Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})}$. Messages $\mathbf{x}_1 = [2\ 2]^t$, $\mathbf{x}_2 = [\frac{-5+\sqrt{5}}{2}\ \frac{-5-\sqrt{5}}{2}]^t$, the optimal coefficient vector is $\mathbf{a} = [5\ 1]^t$, and the correctly recovered lattice point is $\lambda = a_1\mathbf{x}_1 + a_2\mathbf{x}_2 = [\frac{15+\sqrt{5}}{2}\ \frac{15-\sqrt{5}}{2}]^t$.



(b) $\mathbf{h} = [0.8995\ -1.6384]^t$, SNR = 10dB, $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_2 = \Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})}$. Messages $\mathbf{x}_1 = [-2-\sqrt{5}\ \ -2+\sqrt{5}]^t$, $\mathbf{x}_2 = [\frac{-3+\sqrt{5}}{2}\ \frac{-3-\sqrt{5}}{2}]^t$, the optimal coefficient vector is $\mathbf{a} = [0\ 1]$, but the function $\varphi(\lambda)$ is maximized for multiple values of λ.

Fig. 4: Behavior of $\varphi(\lambda)$ in dimension $n = 2$ for $K = 2$ transmitters.

For the ease of analysis, we start by making two simplifications.

i) For attempting to decode to an estimate $\hat{\lambda}$, a relay is able compute the pairs $(\mathbf{q}, \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}))$ over which to take the sum. These pairs correspond to all vectors of the form $\mathbf{q}+\varepsilon(\mathbf{q}) = M_{\mathcal{L}}\hat{U}\mathbf{z}$, where $\mathbf{z} \in \left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nK} \middle|\, ||\mathbf{x}||^2 \leq N\right\}$. The perturbations $\varepsilon(\mathbf{q})$ complicate any analysis of the function $\varphi(\lambda)$, so that we are forced to slightly simplify the expression.

   For the subsequent analysis of the function $\varphi(\lambda)$, we can estimate $\varphi(\lambda)$ by disregarding these tiny perturbations and set $\varepsilon(\mathbf{q}) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \overline{\mathcal{L}}$, without altering the behavior of $\varphi(\lambda)$, as affirmed in Figure 5.

ii) Since the points $\mathbf{q}$ involved in the sum are the result of rounding $\hat{U}\mathbf{t}$ pointwise to the nearest integer, by setting $\varepsilon(\mathbf{q}) = 0$ we end up summing repeatedly over the same set $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$.

   For our analysis, we restrict to a sum over distinct points in $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$, as multiple summations over $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ only affects the magnitude of $\varphi(\lambda)$, not its behavior (see Figure 6).

In summary, we can analyze the behavior of the function $\varphi(\lambda)$ by considering an approximation

$$\boxed{\psi(\lambda) = \sum_{\mathbf{q}\in\overline{\mathcal{L}}} \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\,||\omega(\lambda) - \mathbf{q}||^2\right\}.} \tag{54}$$



Fig. 5: Behavior of $\varphi(\lambda)$ for $\varepsilon(\mathbf{q}) = 0$ versus $\varepsilon(\mathbf{q}) \neq 0$.



Fig. 6: Difference in magnitude of $\varphi(\lambda)$ when summing multiple times over points in $\mathcal{L}$ (left) and summing only over unique points (right).

Remark 7. *As previously mentioned, we notice that $\mathcal{L}$ is a sum of $K-1$ lattices, hence itself a lattice for $K = 2$. As soon as $K > 2$, however, while $\mathcal{L}$ is still an additive subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^n$, it lacks a discrete structure and thus is not a lattice. An example of $\mathcal{L}$ for $n = 2$ and $K = 3$ is depicted in Figure 7.*

In the following, we will differentiate the cases $K = 2$ and $K > 2$ due to the above remark.



(a) K = 3 transmitters employing the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2$, fixed channel $\mathbf{h} = [-0.6003, 0.4900, 0.7394]^t$.



(b) K = 3 transmitters employing the lattice $\Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})}$, fixed channel $\mathbf{h} = [-0.8314, -0.9792, -1.1564]^t$.

Fig. 7: Sum of $(K-1) = 2$ lattices $\mathcal{L}$ in dimension $n = 2$. The depicted points correspond to coefficient vectors $\mathbf{z} \in [-1, 1]^4$, and the density increases rapidly. The above are only two examples; the same lattices at the transmitters can yield very differently looking lattice sums for varying parameters.

A. $K = 2$: *The Flatness Factor of* $\psi(\lambda)$

If the intermediate relay aims to decode a linear combination of $K = 2$ codewords, the ML decoding metric (52) is a sum over lattice points, as remarked above.

In order to characterize the flatness behavior of the function $\varphi(\lambda)$, we first define the *flatness factor* of a general lattice Λ.

Definition 7. *[3] Let Λ be a full lattice of dimension n, and for $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ define the function*

$$\phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{y}) := \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\Lambda} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\,||\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}||^2\right\}. \tag{55}$$

The flatness factor *of the lattice Λ is defined as the ratio*

$$\varepsilon_\Lambda := \frac{E_\mathbf{y}\left[\phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{y})\right]}{\max\limits_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{y})}, \tag{56}$$

where the expected value of $\phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{y})$ is defined as

$$E_\mathbf{y}[\phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{y})] := \frac{1}{\nu_\Lambda}\int_{\mathcal{V}(\Lambda)} \phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{y})d\mathbf{y}. \tag{57}$$

Remark 8. *The expected value $E_{\mathbf{y}}[\phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{y})]$ as defined above exists for lattice-periodic functions, such as ϕ_Λ. that the maximum also exists follows from the continuity of ϕ_Λ, so that the definition of the flatness factor as above is justified.*

We illustrate the flatness factor of a lattice with the help of an example. For our analysis later on, and in order to achieve a meaningful comparison, the lattices at the transmitters will be normalized to unit volume. The meaningfulness of such normalization is illustrated in Figure 8.



Fig. 8: Flatness Factor of the lattices $\mathbb{Z}^4$ and D_4. Although the lattice D_4 seems to behave better, after normalization to unit volume it loses against $\mathbb{Z}^4$.

Since $\mathcal{L}$ is a lattice in this particular case, we can define a function characterizing the flatness behavior of $\psi(\lambda)$ by considering all of $\mathcal{L}$ as follows:

Definition 8. *The* Flatness Factor *of $\psi(\lambda)$ (cf.* (54)*) for $K = 2$ is defined as*

$$\varepsilon_{\psi(\lambda)} := \varepsilon_{\mathcal{L}}. \tag{58}$$

Remark 9. *The restriction $K = 2$ is crucial, since then $\mathcal{L}$ is a lattice, and both the expected value and maximum on the right hand side of* (56) *exist.*

Proposition 2 (See also [3])**.** *Let $\tau := 1/(2\pi\sigma^2)$. Then, the flatness factor $\varepsilon_{\psi(\lambda)}$ characterizing the function $\psi(\lambda)$ can be expressed as*

$$\varepsilon_{\psi(\lambda)}(\tau) = \frac{1}{\nu_{\mathcal{L}}\tau^{\frac{n}{2}}\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right)}, \tag{59}$$

where $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}(q) := \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{L}} q^{||\mathbf{x}||^2}$ *is the theta series of the lattice* $\mathcal{L}$.

Proof. We begin by computing $E_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\phi_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{y})\right]$ along the lines of [3]. For $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{L})$ the fundamental Voronoi cell of $\mathcal{L}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\omega(\lambda)}\left[\psi_{\mathcal{L}}(\omega(\lambda))\right] &= \frac{1}{\nu_{\mathcal{L}}}\int_{\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{L})}\sum_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{L}}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\left|\left|\omega(\lambda)-\mathbf{q}\right|\right|^2\right\}d\omega(\lambda)\\
&= \frac{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n}{\nu_{\mathcal{L}}}\sum_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{L}}\int_{\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{L})}\frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\left|\left|\omega(\lambda)-\mathbf{q}\right|\right|^2\right\}d\omega(\lambda)\\
&= \frac{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n}{\nu_{\mathcal{L}}}\sum_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{L}}\int_{\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{L})+\mathbf{q}}\frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\left|\left|\mathbf{t}\right|\right|^2\right\}d\mathbf{t}\\
&= \frac{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n}{\nu_{\mathcal{L}}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\left|\left|\mathbf{t}\right|\right|^2\right\}d\mathbf{t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the integrand is a probability density function, and by defining $\tau := \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma}$, we conclude

$$E_{\omega(\lambda)}\left[\phi_{\mathcal{L}}(\omega(\lambda))\right] = \frac{1}{\nu_{\mathcal{L}}\tau^{\frac{n}{2}}}.$$

Next, for $\delta\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, a lattice $\Lambda\in\mathbb{R}^n$, and $\mathbf{x}\in\Lambda$, define the functions

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y},\delta) &= \exp\left\{-\pi\left|\left|\frac{(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})}{\delta}\right|\right|^2\right\},\\
\theta_{\Lambda}(\mathbf{y},\delta) &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\Lambda}\theta_{\Lambda}(\mathbf{y},\delta) = \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{L}}\exp\left\{-\pi\left|\left|\frac{(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})}{\delta}\right|\right|^2\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{L}^*$ denote the dual lattice of $\mathcal{L}$. Using Lemma 1 and (11), write

$$\theta_{\mathcal{L}}(\omega(\lambda),\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma) = \nu_{\mathcal{L}^*}\hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{L}^*}(\omega(\lambda),\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma) = \nu_{\mathcal{L}^*}\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{L}^*}\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}}(\omega(\lambda),\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma).$$

Note that $\theta_{\mathbf{x}}(\omega(\lambda),\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma) = \theta_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{0}+\omega(\lambda),\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)$, so that

$$\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}}(\omega(\lambda),\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma) = e^{2\pi i\langle\mathbf{x},\omega(\lambda)\rangle}\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{0},\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma),$$

and consequently

$$\theta_{\mathcal{L}}(\omega(\lambda),\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma) = \nu_{\mathcal{L}^*}\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{L}^*}e^{2\pi i\langle\omega(\lambda),\mathbf{x}\rangle}\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{0},\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma) \le \nu_{\mathcal{L}^*}\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{L}^*}\hat{\theta}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{0},\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma) = \theta_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{0},\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma).$$

The last inequality holds since $\hat{\theta}(\mathbf{0},\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma) = (\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n\theta(\mathbf{0},1/(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma))$ and $\hat{\theta}(\mathbf{0},\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)\ge 0$.

We conclude that

$$\max_{\omega(\lambda)\in\mathbb{R}^n} \psi(\lambda) = \max_{\omega(\lambda)\in\mathbb{R}^n} \theta_{\mathcal{L}}(\omega(\lambda), \sqrt{2\pi}\sigma) = \theta_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{0}, \sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)$$
$$= \sum_{\mathbf{t}\in\mathcal{L}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\left|\left|\mathbf{t}\right|\right|^2\right\} = \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}}\right) = \Theta_{\mathcal{L}}\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right),$$

which completes the proof. □

Remark 10. *The description of $\varepsilon_\Lambda(\tau)$ in Proposition 2 allows to study the flatness factor as a function of the noise variance σ^2, and hence of the* SNR. *Further, note that $0 \leq \varepsilon_\Lambda(\tau) \leq 1$ (cf.* (56)*, and we want to be as close to 0 as possible, as by the definition of ε_Λ smaller values imply a distinctive maximum, which inhibits a flat behavior.*

In the following, we will consider various lattices in dimensions $n = 2$ and $n = 4$, all of which have been introduced in Section II. The flatness factors of the considered lattices are depicted in Figure 9. By Proposition 2, the flatness factor depends on the volume and the theta series of the lattice, which itself depends indirectly on the volume. Hence, to achieve a meaningful comparison, we normalize the considered lattices to have unit volume.



(a) Comparison of the flatness factor $\varepsilon_\Lambda(\tau)$ of various lattices of dimension $n = 2$.



(b) Comparison of the flatness factor $\varepsilon_\Lambda(\tau)$ of various lattices of dimension $n = 4$.

Fig. 9: Approximated flatness factor of various lattices in dimension $n = 2, 4$.

Remark 11. *In order to verify the correct prediction of $\varepsilon_\Lambda(\tau)$ for the lattices depicted in Figure 9, we computed this quantity in addition by calculating the corresponding theta series as a truncated sum over the lattice points.*

For the numerical results displayed in Figure 10, however, the approximation derived in Proposition 1 was used for reduced complexity.

Our goal is to analyze the flatness of the function $\psi(\lambda)$ which, as we have seen, corresponds to studying the flatness factor of the lattice $\mathcal{L}$. The generator matrix $M_\mathcal{L}$ depends on the channel, and clearly the theta series of $\mathcal{L}$ is not known in closed form. Here is where the approximation of $\Theta_\Lambda(q)$ derived in Proposition 1 proves useful.

For the following results, we let $K = 2$ transmitters employ the same lattice Λ, which is normalized to unit volume. We fix a finite subset of Λ to serve as the codebook by choosing a set of coefficient vectors $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ to generate the codewords. With this convention, the size of the codebooks is the same for each of the employed lattices, and the corresponding power constraints are presented in Table I below.

n = 2	$\mathbb{Z}^2$	A_2	$\Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2})}$	$\Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{3})}$	$\Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})}$
P	4	4.6188	4.2426	4.6188	4.4721
n = 4	$\mathbb{Z}^4$	D_4	A_4^*	$\Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2},\sqrt{5})}$	$\Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{6},\sqrt{7})}$
P	4	7.0711	10.1684	4.7434	5.5480

TABLE I: Power constraint for the employed finite codebook for the considered lattices in dimension $n = 2$ and $n = 4$. The size of the codebooks is the same for each of the lattices.

Remark 12. *For fair comparison, since the flatness factor depends on the volume of the lattice, we normalized the volume of the considered lattices to one. It is hence not possible to simultaneously normalize the power. Instead, we fix a set of coefficient vectors $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ which generate all possible codewords, so that the resulting codebooks are of the same size for each of the lattices, and use the lattice-dependent power constraints computed in Table I.*

The quantity in which we are interested is the expected flatness factor $E\left[\varepsilon_{\psi(\lambda)}(\tau)\right]$*, which we estimate over 10^6 random channels for varying $\tau = \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma^2} = \frac{\rho}{2\pi P}$. Note that τ depends on the power P, so that by the unequal power for different lattices, the same value τ corresponds to*

slightly different values of $\rho = 2\pi P\tau$*. Thus, for a readable plot, we account for this shift by plotting the results with respect to the actual* SNR*.*



Fig. 10: Expected flatness factors of $\psi(\lambda)$ for lattices of dimensions $n = 2$ (left) and $n = 4$ (right).

The results depicted in Figure 10 suggest that, independently of the dimension, decoding errors due to ambiguous decisions can be reduced by allowing the transmitters to use for instance algebraic lattices. The algebraic lattices considered in dimension $n = 2$ are very comparable in shape, and consequently perform very similarly; however they all yield better results than the lattices $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and A_2.

The results in dimension $n = 4$ are of a similar nature. The lattices arising from biquadratic number fields outperform the classical lattices D_4 and A_4^*, and only $\mathbb{Z}^4$ exhibits similar performance.

Overall, the numerical results clearly show that it is beneficial to allow real, in particular algebraic lattices at the transmitters, instead of restricting to integer lattices. Given the small difference in performance between the algebraic lattices, it is difficult to propose an optimal candidate. Hence, for the purpose of code design, the above results should not be considered alone, but rather as a support criterion together with further design criteria that will arise by analyzing the probability of incorrect decoding in the context of compute-and-forward relaying.

Note, however, that the usual criteria do not seem to be relevant for the expected flatness factor of the resulting object $\mathcal{L}$. The best sphere packing, A_2, as well as the densest lattice $\Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})}$ are not

the best performing lattices. Also other standard quantities, such as the discriminant, do not seem to be the determining factor in the observed hierarchy. Nonetheless, multiple randomly generated lattices were tested, all of which performed significantly worse than the lattices depicted above. It is clear that, although not straightforward to see, there is a structural reason behind the order shown in the plots.

B. $K > 2$: The Average Flatness Factor of $\psi(\lambda)$

As we have mentioned previously, $\mathcal{L}$ is no longer a lattice if $K > 2$. While it is still an additive subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^n$, it does not exhibit a discrete structure. Thus, the function $\psi(\lambda)$ cannot be extended to a sum over all of $\mathcal{L}$ as in the case $K = 2$, since it would not converge. This also implies that we cannot define $\varepsilon_{\psi(\lambda)} = \varepsilon_{\mathcal{L}}$ similar to Definition 8, as the maximum on the right hand side of (56) does not exist.

We fix $K = 3$, so that $\mathcal{L}$ is a sum of $K - 1 = 2$ lattices, $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2$. Due to the above observation, we can only consider the function $\psi(\lambda)$ by fixing a finite subset $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_1$ and $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_2 \subset \mathcal{L}_2$. Even with this restriction, $\max_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \phi_{\overline{\mathcal{L}}}(\mathbf{y})$ is often attained for $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n \backslash \mathcal{L}$, as shown exemplarily in Figure 11. This fact makes the analysis difficult. Even if we could compute the



Fig. 11: Example in dimension $n = 1$ of the function $\phi(\mathbf{y})$ for $K = 3$ transmitters. The maxima of the function are attained outside the points in $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2$.

maximum, there is no straightforward way of determining $E_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\phi_{\overline{\mathcal{L}}}(\mathbf{y})\right]$, since $\mathcal{L}$ is dense in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

This motivates the definition of the *average flatness factor* of a sum of lattices, and consequently of $\psi(\lambda)$, for the case $K > 2$.

The flatness factor of a lattice measures how the maximum of the considered function $\phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{y})$ deviates from the norm. Since Λ is a lattice, we can measure this deviation centered at the origin. For $K = 3$ transmitters and $\Lambda = \Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2$ a sum of two lattices, we need to deal with two lattices simultaneously. Considering one lattice, say Λ_1, we can interpret Λ_2 as points which shift the fixed lattice around. To account for these shifts, we propose to consider the *average flatness factor*, that is, to measure the ratio (56) for one of the lattices Λ_i centered at a finite number of points of the second lattice, and symmetrically swap the roles of the first and second lattice. A more formal definition is given below.

Definition 9. *Let $\Lambda = \Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2$ be a sum of two lattices, and consider finite subsets $\overline{\Lambda}_1 \subset \Lambda_1$ and $\overline{\Lambda}_2 \subset \Lambda_2$ such that $\left|\overline{\Lambda}_1\right| = \left|\overline{\Lambda}_2\right| = C$. For $i, j = 1, 2$, $i \neq j$, define the function*

$$\phi_{\Lambda_i}(\mathbf{y}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) := \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda_i} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left|\left|\mathbf{y} - (\mathbf{x} + \tilde{\mathbf{x}})\right|\right|^2 \right\}, \tag{60}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \Lambda_j$. The average flatness factor *of the lattice sum $\Lambda = \Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2$ is defined as*

$$\varepsilon_\Lambda := \frac{1}{2C} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \overline{\Lambda}_2} \frac{E_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\phi_{\Lambda_1}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})\right]}{\max\limits_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \phi_{\Lambda_1}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})} + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \overline{\Lambda}_1} \frac{E_{\mathbf{y}}\left[\phi_{\Lambda_2}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})\right]}{\max\limits_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \phi_{\Lambda_2}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})} \right). \tag{61}$$

Proposition 3. *Let $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2$ be the sum of two lattices generated by the matrix $M_\mathcal{L}$ (49), and fix finite subsets $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1$ and $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_2$ such that $\left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1\right| = \left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}_2\right| = C$. Define $\tau := 1/(2\pi\sigma^2)$. Then, the average flatness factor $\varepsilon_{\psi(\lambda)}$ characterizing the function $\psi(\lambda)$ can be expressed as*

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\psi(\lambda)}(\tau) &= \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_{\mathcal{L}_1}(\tau) + \varepsilon_{\mathcal{L}_2}(\tau)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\nu_{\mathcal{L}_1} \Theta_{\mathcal{L}_1}\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right) + \nu_{\mathcal{L}_2} \Theta_{\mathcal{L}_2}\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right)}{\left(\nu_{\mathcal{L}_1} \nu_{\mathcal{L}_2}\right) \tau^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(\Theta_{\mathcal{L}_1}\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right) \Theta_{\mathcal{L}_2}\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right)\right)}. \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of Proposition 2. For $i = 1, 2$, $j \neq i$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \Lambda_j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\omega(\lambda)}\left[\psi_{\mathcal{L}_i}(\omega(\lambda), \tilde{\mathbf{x}})\right] &= \frac{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n}{\nu_{\mathcal{L}_i}} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{L}_i} \int_{\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{L}_i)} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left|\left|(\omega(\lambda) - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) - \mathbf{q}\right|\right|^2 \right\} d\omega(\lambda) \\ &= \frac{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n}{\nu_{\mathcal{L}_i}} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{L}_i} \int_{\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{L}_i) + (\mathbf{q} + \tilde{\mathbf{x}})} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left|\left|\mathbf{t}\right|\right|^2 \right\} d\mathbf{t} \\ &= \frac{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n}{\nu_{\mathcal{L}_i}} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{L}_i} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left|\left|\mathbf{t}\right|\right|^2 \right\} d\mathbf{t} \\ &= \frac{1}{\nu_{\mathcal{L}_i} \tau^{\frac{n}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

From the proof of Proposition 2, we know that $\max_{\omega(\lambda)\in\mathbb{R}^n} \psi_{\mathcal{L}_i}(\omega(\lambda), \tilde{\mathbf{x}})$ is attained for $(\omega(\lambda)-\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathcal{L}_i$, that is, $\omega(\lambda) \in \mathcal{L}$. Hence,

$$\max_{\omega(\lambda)\in\mathbb{R}^n} \phi_{\mathcal{L}_i}(\omega(\lambda), \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \Theta_{\mathcal{L}_i}\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\overline{\mathcal{L}}_j} \frac{E_{\omega(\lambda)}\left[\psi_{\mathcal{L}_i}(\omega(\lambda), \mathbf{x})\right]}{\max\limits_{\omega(\lambda)\in\mathbb{R}^n} \psi_{\mathcal{L}_i}(\omega(\lambda), \mathbf{x})} &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{L}_j} \frac{1}{\nu_{\mathcal{L}_i}\tau^{\frac{n}{2}}\Theta_{\mathcal{L}_i}\left(e^{-\pi\tau}\right)} \\ &= C\varepsilon_{\mathcal{L}_i}(\tau),\end{aligned}$$

and hence the result follows.

□

We conclude by illustrating, in analogy to the results obtained in the case $K = 2$, the expected average flatness factor of $\psi(\lambda)$ in Figure 12 for various lattices at the transmitters. The encoding lattices are normalized to have unit volume, and the same power constraints from Table I are also used for this analysis. As in the previous case for $K = 2$, by fixing the set of coefficient vectors $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ we obtain codebooks of the same size for each of the considered lattices. The different power constraints, however, results in a different SNR for equal values of τ (cf. Remark 12). Hence, we illustrate the results with respect to the actual SNR.

As in the previous case where $K = 2$, the algebraic lattices still outperform the other lattices, and in contrast to the case $K = 2$, the gap between them has widened slightly. Their performance is however still very similar. The results suggest that the number of transmitters, although inhibiting $\mathcal{L}$ from exhibiting a lattice structure, does not affect the hierarchy of the lattices in terms of flatness behavior.

VI. Conclusions

In this article, the maximum-likelihood framework in the context of compute-and-forward relaying, derived in [3] for integer lattices, was extended to allow for any real lattice at the transmitters. The resulting decoding metric was further analyzed for the first time for the actual resulting lattice sums $\mathcal{L}$ over which a sum of Gaussian measures needs to be performed at a relay. To enable such analysis, an approximation of the theta series of a lattice was derived, which can be computed given merely the generator matrix of the lattice.



Fig. 12: Comparison of the average flatness factors $\varepsilon_{\psi(\lambda)}(\tau)$ for $K = 3$ transmitters employing various lattices of dimension $n = 2$.

It was further noted that a straightforward extension of the analysis to $K > 2$ transmitters is not possible, and an alternative quantity to consider was defined for the case $K = 3$ and employed for an analysis of the decoding metric in this case.

The flatness criterion in code design for compute-and-forward should, however, not be considered alone, but rather as a supportive criterion. It is hence important and immediate future work to analyze the probability of incorrect decoding at the relay, an expression from which it will be possible to derive explicit code design criteria. Equally important is the derivation of efficient decoding algorithms to solve the maximization problem, which maximum-likelihood decoding in this setting amounts to, a problem that has only been solved in the smallest case $n = 1$, but remaining open for $n \geq 2$.

REFERENCES

[1] B. Nazer and M. Gastpar, "Compute-and-Forward: Harnessing Interference Through Structured Codes", *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 6463–6486, 2011.

[2] C. Feng, D. Silva and F. R. Kschischang, "An Algebraic Approach to Physical-Layer Network Coding", *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 7576–7596, 2013.

[3] J.-C. Belfiore, "Lattice Codes for the Compute-and-Forward Protocol: The Flatness Factor", *IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, 2011.

[4] J.-C. Belfiore and C. Ling, "The Flatness Factor in Lattice Network Coding: Design Criterion and Decoding Algorithm", *Zurich Seminar on Communications*, 2012.

[5] A. Mejri and G. Rekaya-Ben Othman, "Efficient Decoding Algorithms for the Compute-and-Forward Strategy", *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 63, no. 7, pp.2475–2485, 2015.

[6] N. E. Tunali, K. R. Narayanan, J. J. Boutros and Yu-Chih Huang, "Lattices over Eisenstein Integers for Compute-and-Forward", *50th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, 2012.

[7] Yu-chih Huang, K. R. Narayanan and Ping-Chung Wang, "Adaptive Compute-and-Forward with Lattice Codes over Algebraic Integers", *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2012.

[8] W. Ebeling, "Lattices and Codes", 3^{rd} Edition, Springer Spektrum, 2013.

[9] J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, "Sphere Packings, Lattices and Groups", Third Edition, Springer-Verlag, 1999.

[10] D. A. Marcus, "Number Fields", Springer-Verlag, 1945.

[11] A. Osmane and J.-C. Belfiore, "The Compute-and-Forward Protocol: Implementation and Practical Aspects", available on arXiv:1107.0300v1, 2011.

[12] S. Sahraei and M. Gastpar, "Polynomially Solvable Instances of the Shortest and Closest Vector Problems with Applications to Compute-and-Forward", available on arXiv:1512.06667, 2015.

[13] A. Barreal, J. Pääkkönen, D. Karpuk, C. Hollanti and O. Tirkkonen, "A low-complexity message recovery method for Compute-and-Forward relaying", *IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, 2015.

[14] R. P. Groenewegen, "An Arithmetic Analogue of Clifford's Theorem", *Journal de Thorie des Nombres de Bordeaux*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 143–156, 2001.

[15] M. Widmer, "Lipschitz Class, Narrow Class, and Counting Lattice Points", *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 140, no. 2, pp. 677–689, 2011.

[16] D. Micciancio and O. Regev, "Worst-Case to Average-Case Reductions Based on Gaussian Measures", *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 267–302, 2007.